IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

KARISSA BRUEGGEMAN, et al.,)
)
  Plaintiffs,   )
)
  v.   )   Case No.: 3:05-cv-106-GPM
)
RT ST. LOUIS FRANCHISE, LLC.,)
)
  Defendant.   )

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the "Stipulated Protective Order Governing the Production of Proprietary and Confidential Information," construed as a Motion for Protective Order, filed by the parties on September 29, 2005 (Doc. 33). The motion is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c) provides that the Court may enter a protective order "for good cause shown" in a number of situations. Instead of filing a motion that indicates the good cause that exists for the entry of a protective order, the parties have filed, and submitted to chambers[1], the proposed protective order itself. The Seventh Circuit has repeatedly held that it is the Court's duty to determine whether good cause exists and that the Court must not merely rubber stamp a protective order merely because the parties believe it is appropriate. See Citizens First National Bank of Princeton v. Cincinnati Insurance Company, 178 F.3d 943, 944 (7th Cir. 1999); Jepson, Inc. v. Makita Electric Works, LTD., 30 F.3d 854, 858-859 (7th Cir. 1994); American Telephone and Telegraph Company v. Grady, 594 F.2d 594, 596-597 (1979). In this

---

[1] The document is submitted in .pdf format. Such a format is unacceptable. The parties are directed to review the CM/ECF manual and submit proposed orders in the proper format, i.e. a word processing format.

instance, no good cause has been shown. The Court also adds that the second paragraph of the

proposed order seeks to protect *all* documents provided by the defendant in this case. Such a

broad restriction on public access to all documents in this case would require a significant

showing that these documents come within the requirements of Rule 26(c).

DATED: October 4, 2005

<u>**s/ Donald G. Wilkerson**</u>
DONALD G. WILKERSON
United States Magistrate Judge